REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **March 15, 2005** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-3, 5-13, and 15-34. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-13, 15, 17-22, and 24-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Rothrock (USPN 5,408,470 hereinafter "Rothrock"). Claims 1, 2, 5-13, 15-22, and 24-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Zhu (USPN 6,792,436, hereinafter "Zhu"). Claims 3 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothrock. Claims 6 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothrock in view of Zhu.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Independent claims 1, 12, 21, 28, and 32-34 were rejected as being anticipated by Rothrock and Zhu.

Applicant respectfully points out that both Rothrock and Zhu teach away from the present invention.

The invention of Rothrock **requires an arbitrator** to facilitate communication between participants. Specifically, one of the "*agents or participants in the meeting is known as the arbitrator*" (see Rothrock, col. 7, lines 55-56). Further, a participant first "*requests an index for the modifications from an arbitrator*" (see col. 3, lines 3-4). Next, the "*arbitrator responds to the participant requesting the index for the modifications*" (see col. 3, lines 7-8). The participant then "*modifies the associated local copy of the shared data according to the index received from the arbitrator*" (see col. 3, lines 8-10). Finally, the participant "*transmits the local modifications to the plurality of participants*" (see col. 3, lines 11-12). In other words, the invention in Rothrock requires a system to first communicate with an arbitrator before communicating with another system.

12

In contrast, the present invention **does not require an arbitrator** to facilitate communication between two systems. Specifically, in the present invention, a first system can directly distribute *"the object change information from the first system to the second system to cause the second system to merge the object change information into the object cache so as to synchronize the second system with the first system"* (see page 2, lines 10-16).

Note that, for obvious efficiency reasons, it is advantageous for a system to directly communicate with another system without involving an arbitrator. Specifically, communicating with an arbitrator before communicating with another system increases the delay which decreases the efficiency of the overall process.

Furthermore, the invention of Zhu is directed towards sending the **full information** of a cached object. Specifically, for *"update requests the full object state of the cache object is sent with the request"* (see Zhu, col. 6, lines 12-13). Note that the *"full object state of a cache object includes the data associated with all fields in an object"* (see Zhu, col. 6, lines 13-15).

In contrast, the present invention is specifically directed towards sending **minimal information** of a cached object. Specifically, the object change sets includes *"a minimal set of information regarding changes to the objects"* (see page 7, lines 32-33).

Note that it is advantageous to send minimal information because *"less data will be required to be sent across the communication link"* (see page 8, line 1-2).

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 12, 21, 28, 32, 33, and 34 to clarify that, (a) the system determines a minimal object change information, and (b) the object change information is directly distributed from the first system to the second system. These amendments find support on page 8, lines 1-2, and page 2, lines 10-16.

13

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 12, 21, 28, and 32-34 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-11, which depend upon claim 1, claims 13-20, which depend upon claim 12, claims 22-27, which depend upon claim 21, and claims 29-31, which depend upon claim 28, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

14

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Richard A. Park
Registration No. 41,241

Date: April 20, 2005

A. Richard Park
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616
Tel: (530) 759-1661
FAX: (530) 759-1665

15